EXHIBIT A

Case 1:21-cv-11617-AK Document 1-1 Filed 10/01/21 Page 2 of 12

CIVIL ACTION COVER SHEET	DOCKET NUMBER	The Superior Co			(° (10)		
CIVIL ACTION COVER SHEET				THE STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE			Sylva Ser
				Suffolk			
Plaintiff Stephen Levine		Defendant: Maplebear, Inc. (d/b/a Instacart)					
ADDRESS:		ADDRESS:					
Plaintiff Attorney: Shannon Liss-Riordan		Defendant Attor	rnev:				
ADDRESS: Lichten & Liss-Riordan, P.C.		ADDRESS:					
729 Boylston Street, Suite 2000							
Boston, MA 02116							
BBO: 640716		BBO:		8	3/12/20	021	
TYPE OF ACTION A	ND TRACK DESIGN	IATION (see in:	structions se			20	
CODE NO. TYPE OF ACTION	l (specify)		ACK	Allerines intermediate	an Managara	BEEN MADE?	
A04 Employmnet Contract		F		YES	X N	0	
*If "Other" please describe:							
Is there a claim under G.L. c. 9: ☐ YES ☐ NO	3A?		Is there a			ss. R. Civ. P. 231	?
	NT OF DAMAGES P	URSUANT TO		1 1			
					wa wasan		
The following is a full, itemized and detailed statement of the For this form, disregard double or treble damage claims; ind	e facts on which the u icate single damages	indersigned plai s only.	intiff or plainti	ff's counsel re	lies to det	ermine money da	amages.
To the form, distributed a design of the same services of the same services and the same services are same services and the same services and the same services and the same services are same services are same services are same services are same services and the same services are same s		CLAIMS					
A. Documented medical expenses to date							
1. Total hospital expenses				-			_
2. Total doctor expenses	2. Total doctor expenses						
3. Total chiropractic expenses							
4. Total physical therapy expenses						_	
5. Total other expenses (describe below)				_			_
:							
			Subtotal (1-5	5):		\$0.00	
B. Documented lost wages and compensation to date					_		
C. Documented property damages to date				2		5	
D. Reasonably anticipated future medical and hospital expenses						_	
E. Reasonably anticipated lost wages							
F. Other documented items of damages (describe below)				~			
·							
			TOTAL (A-F):		\$0.00	
G. Briefly describe plaintiff's injury, including the nature and	extent of injury:						
N	CONTRAC	CT CLAIMS					_
This action includes a claim involving collection of a c	lebt incurred pursuar	nt to a revolving	credit agreer	nent. Mass. R	. Civ. P. 8	3.1(a).	
Item# Det	ailed Description of E	Each Claim				Amount	
1.							
					Total		
2							773
Signature of Attorney/Unrepresented Plaintiff: X					Date:		
RELATED ACTIONS: Please provide the case number, case	se name, and county	of any related a	actions pendi	ng in the Supe			
TELETIES AS HORSE Florido do caso namber, cas	, and county	, rolated t	pondi	J a.c oapo	2001		
CER'	TIFICATION PURSU	ANT TO SJC R	ULE 1:18				
I hereby certify that I have complied with requirements of Rule 5 of clients with information about court-connected dispute resolution s	the Supreme Judicial C	Court Uniform Rule	s on Dispute F	tesolution (SJC	Rule 1:18)	requiring that I prov	ide my
Signature of Attorney/Unrepresented Plaintiff: X	fixtida	i dioin die advant	agos una alsaa	, amagos or the		August 12, 2021	

Case 1:21-cv-11617-AK Document 1-1 Filed 10/01/21 Page 3 of 12

CIVIL ACTION COVER SHEET INSTRUCTIONS SELECT CATEGORY THAT BEST DESCRIBES YOUR CASE

ED E. Walda Dawa dia

DD Deel Dressell

AC Astlene Invelving the Ctate/Ministrality *

AC Actions involving the	State/Mullicipality	-	LIX Equitable Rei	lieules		iti itedi i iopeity	
AA1 Contract Action involving	a Commonwoolth		D01 Specific Performance of a	Contract	(A)	C01 Land Taking	(F)
AA1 Contract Action involving		A.			(F)	C02 Zoning Appeal, G.L. c. 40A	(F)
Municipality, MBTA, et		(A)	D02 Reach and Apply			C03 Dispute Concerning Title	(F)
AB1 Tortious Action involving		**	D03 Injunction		(F)	C04 Foreclosure of a Mortgage	(1)
Municipality, MBTA, et		(A)	D04 Reform/ Cancel Instrumen		(F)		(\$)
AC1 Real Property Action in			D05 Equitable Replevin		(F)	C05 Condominium Lien & Charges	(X) (X) (F)
Commonwealth, Munic		Α)	D06 Contribution or Indemnifica		(F)	C99 Other Real Property Action	(F)
AD1 Equity Action involving		222	D07 Imposition of a Trust		(A)		
Municipality, MBTA, et		(A)	D08 Minority Shareholder's Sui	it ((A)	MC Miscellaneous Civil Actions	
AE1 Administrative Action in			D09 Interference in Contractua		(F)		
Commonwealth, Munic	ipality, MBTA,etc. ((A)	D10 Accounting		(A)	E18 Foreign Discovery Proceeding	(X)
			D11 Enforcement of Restrictive		(F)	E97 Prisoner Habeas Corpus	(X)
CN Contract/Busi	ness Cases		D12 Dissolution of a Partnershi		(F)	E22 Lottery Assignment, G.L. c. 10, § 28	(x)
			D13 Declaratory Judgment, G.I		(A)		
A01 Services, Labor, and M	aterials ((F)	D14 Dissolution of a Corporation	on ((F)	AB Abuse/Harassment Prevention	
A02 Goods Sold and Delive	red ((F)	D99 Other Equity Action		(F)		
A03 Commercial Paper	((F)				E15 Abuse Prevention Petition, G.L. c. 209A	
A04 Employment Contract	((F)	PA Civil Actions Involving In-	carcerated Part	w†	E21 Protection from Harassment, G.L. c. 258	BE(X)
A05 Consumer Revolving C	redit - M.R.C.P. 8.1 (F)	1 A CIVII Actions involving in	our our area	J		
A06 Insurance Contract		F)				AA Administrative Civil Actions	
A08 Sale or Lease of Real E	Estate	F)	PA1 Contract Action involving a	an			
A12 Construction Dispute		(A)	Incarcerated Party		(A)	E02 Appeal from Administrative Agency,	
A14 Interpleader		F)	PB1 Tortious Action involving a		7. A	G.L. c. 30A	(X)
BA1 Governance, Conduct,			Incarcerated Party		(A)	E03 Certiorari Action, G.L. c. 249, § 4	(X)
Affairs of Entities		(A)	PC1 Real Property Action invol		(* .)	E05 Confirmation of Arbitration Awards	(X)
BA3 Liability of Shareholder			Incarcerated Party		(F)	E06 Mass Antitrust Act, G.L. c. 93, § 9	(A)
Officers, Partners, etc.		(A)	PD1 Equity Action involving an		(1.)	E07 Mass Antitrust Act, G.L. c. 93, § 8	(X)
BB1 Shareholder Derivative		(A)	Incarcerated Party		(F)	E08 Appointment of a Receiver	(X) (X) (A) (X) (X)
BB2 Securities Transactions		(A)	PE1 Administrative Action invo		(1-)	E09 Construction Surety Bond, G.L. c. 149,	15.1
BC1 Mergers, Consolidation					(E)	§§ 29, 29A	(A)
Assets, Issuance of De		(A)	Incarcerated Party		(F)	E10 Summary Process Appeal	(A) (X) (X) (X)
BD1 Intellectual Property		(A)	TD T			E11 Worker's Compensation	(X)
		(A)	TR Torts			E16 Auto Surcharge Appeal	(2)
BD2 Proprietary Information		/A\		/ <u>-</u>		E17 Civil Rights Act, G.L. c.12, § 11H	(A)
Secrets		(A)	B03 Motor Vehicle Negligence			E24 Appeal from District Court	
BG1 Financial Institutions/F		(A)	Injury/Property Damage		(F)		(X)
BH1 Violation of Antitrust or		(A.N.	B04 Other Negligence - Person			Commitment, G.L. c.123, § 9(b)	(\triangle)
Regulation Laws		(A)	Injury/Property Damage		(F)	E25 Pleural Registry (Asbestos cases)	00
A99 Other Contract/Busines	ss Action - Specify ((F)	B05 Products Liability		(A)	E94 Forfeiture, G.L. c. 265, § 56	(X)
			B06 Malpractice - Medical		(A)	E95 Forfeiture, G.L. c. 94C, § 47	(F)
* Choose this case type if A	MV party is the		B07 Malpractice - Other		(A)	E99 Other Administrative Action	(X)
Commonwealth, a municipa		nv.	B08 Wrongful Death - Non-med	dical	(A)	Z01 Medical Malpractice - Tribunal only,	52269
			B15 Defamation		(A)	G.L. c. 231, § 60B	(F) (X)
other governmental entity U			B19 Asbestos		(A)	Z02 Appeal Bond Denial	(X)
case type listed under Admi	nistrative Civil Actic	ns	B20 Personal Injury - Slip & Fa	H .	(F)		
(AA).			B21 Environmental		(F)	SO Sex Offender Review	
	K 15 2		B22 Employment Discriminatio	n	(F)		
† Choose this case type if A			BE1 Fraud, Business Torts, etc.	3.	(A)	E12 SDP Commitment, G.L. c. 123A, § 12	(X)
incarcerated party, UNLESS			B99 Other Tortious Action	2.5	(F)	E14 SDP Petition, G.L. c. 123A, § 9(b)	(X)
type listed under Administra		A)			N-A		
or is a Prisoner Habeas Cor	pus case (E97).		RP Summary Process (Re	al Property)		RC Restricted Civil Actions	
			204.5		^^	E19 Sex Offender Registry, G.L. c. 6, § 178N	/ (Y)
			S01 Summary Process - Resid		(X)		
			S02 Summary Process - Comn		/E\	E27 Minor Seeking Consent, G.L. c.112, § 12	ro(v)
		Venne	Non-residential		(F)		
		TRA	NSFER YOUR SELECTION	TO THE FAC	E SHEET		
EXAMPLE:							
CORENC	TV6=	OF 40TH	NI (annulf)	CK	LIAC A II	IDV CLAIM BEEN MADES	
CODE NO.	TYPE	OF ACTIO	ON (specify) TRA	CR	HAS A JU	JRY CLAIM BEEN MADE?	
D02	Maton \/- L!-!- *!	nallacese	Dersonal Injun:	•8	XES	☐ NO	
B03	Motor Vehicle No	ealiaence-	Personal Injury F	E2 2			

STATEMENT OF DAMAGES PURSUANT TO G.L. c. 212, § 3A

DUTY OF THE PLAINTIFF - The plaintiff shall set forth, on the face of the civil action cover sheet (or attach additional sheets as necessary), a statement specifying the facts on which the plaintiff relies to determine money damages. A copy of such civil action cover sheet, including the statement as to the damages, shall be served with the complaint. A clerk-magistrate shall not accept for filing a complaint, except as otherwise provided by law, unless it is accompanied by such a statement signed by the attorney or self-represented litigant.

DUTY OF THE DEFENDANT - If the defendant believes that the statement of damages filed by the plaintiff is inadequate, the defendant may file with his/her answer a statement specifying the potential damages which may result if the plaintiff prevails.

A CIVIL COVER SHEET MUST BE FILED WITH EACH COMPLAINT.
FAILURE TO COMPLETE THIS COVER SHEET THOROUGHLY AND ACCURATELY
MAY RESULT IN DISMISSAL OF THIS ACTION.

Case 1:21-cv-11617-AK Document 1-1 Filed 10/01/21 Page 4 of 12

Summons	2184CV01853	Trial Court of Massachus The Superior Court	etts 🐞
STEPHEN LEVINE, on behalf of himself and all		Michael Joseph Donovan	Clerk of Courts County
others similarly situated	Plaintiff(s)	COURT NAME & ADDRESS: SUPERIOR CIVIL COURT	
		SUFFOLK COUNTY COURTHOUSE	
MAPLEBEAR, INC. (d/b/a INSTACART)	Defendant(s)	THREE PEMBERTON SQ 12th Floor BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108	ge de

THIS SUMMONS IS DIRECTED TO Maplebear, Inc. (d/b/a Instacart) (Defendant's name)

You are being sued. The Plaintiff(s) named above has started a lawsuit against you. A copy of the Plaintiff's Complaint filed against you is attached to this summons and the original complaint has been filed in the Court.

YOU MUST ACT PROMPTLY TO PROTECT YOUR RIGHTS.

1. You must respond to this lawsuit in writing within 20 days.

If you do not respond, the court may decide the case against you and award the Plaintiff everything asked for in the complaint. You will also lose the opportunity to tell your side of the story. You must respond to this lawsuit in writing even if you expect to resolve this matter with the Plaintiff. If you need more time to respond, you may request an extension of time in writing from the Court.

2. How to Respond.

To respond to this lawsuit, you must file a written to response with the court and mail a copy to the Plaintiff's Attorney (or the Plaintiff, if unrepresented). You can do this by:

a) Filing your signed original response with the Clerk's Office for Civil Business,

Court

(address), by mail or in person AND

b) Delivering or mailing a copy of your response to the Plaintiff's Attorney/Plaintiff at the following address:

3. What to Include in Your Response.

An "Answer" is one type of response to a Complaint. Your Answer must state whether you agree or disagree with the fact(s) alleged in each paragraph of the Complaint. Some defenses, called affirmative defenses, must be stated in your Answer or you may lose your right to use them in court. If you have any claims against the Plaintiff (referred to as counterclaims) that are based on the same facts or transaction described in the Complaint, then you must include those claims in your Answer. Otherwise, you may lose your right to sue the Plaintiff about anything related to this lawsuit. If you want to have your case heard by a jury, you must specifically request a jury trial in your court no more than 10 days after sending your Answer.

A True copy Attest: Joseph P Copey
Deputy Sherift Suffolk County

9-22-21

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

SUPERIOR COURT C. A. NO
)))
))
8/12/2021
))
)))

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

- 1. This case is brought on behalf of individuals who have worked for Maplebear, Inc. d/b/a Instacart ("Instacart") as delivery drivers or full-service shoppers (both referred to here as "drivers") in Massachusetts. Instacart provides on-demand grocery shopping and grocery delivery services through a mobile phone application and website. Instacart is based in San Francisco, California, but it does business across the United States and extensively throughout Massachusetts.
- 2. As described further below, Instacart has willfully misclassified its drivers as independent contractors in violation of Mass. Gen. L. c. 149 § 148B. In so doing, Instacart has violated Mass. Gen. L. c. 149 § 148 by failing to reimburse these drivers' necessary business expenses such as gas and car maintenance and Mass. Gen. L. c. 151 §§ 1, 7 by failing to pay these drivers the Massachusetts minimum wage after accounting for drivers' expenses and excluding their tips (as Instacart is not entitled to take the tip credit against the minimum wage). Instacart has also failed to provide its

independent contractor drivers with paid sick leave at a rate of at least one hour for every thirty hours worked in violation of the Massachusetts Earned Sick Time Law, Mass. Gen. L. c. 149 § 148C.

- 3. Instacart's agreement with its drivers contains a mandatory arbitration provision, purporting to require drivers to arbitrate any disputes they have with Instacart, including disputes related to their classification as independent contractors.
- 4. Plaintiff contends that this arbitration agreement is not enforceable, as he is a transportation worker exempt from arbitration under the Federal Arbitration Act ("FAA"), 9 U.S.C. § 1, and the agreement is unenforceable under Massachusetts law because it contains a class action waiver that violates Massachusetts public policy. See Archer v. GrubHub, Inc., No. 1984CV03277-BLS1 (Mass. Super. Ct. Jan. 11, 2021) (finding GrubHub delivery drivers exempt from arbitration under FAA); see also Waithaka v. Amazon.com Inc., 966 F.3d 10 (1st Cir. 2020) (refusing to enforce arbitration agreement for Amazon delivery drivers).

PARTIES

- Plaintiff Stephen Levine is an adult resident of Lynn, Massachusetts. He worked as an Instacart independent contractor delivery driver in the Boston,
 Massachusetts, area and the North Shore from approximately July 2019 to July 2020.
- 6. Defendant Maplebear, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its headquarters in San Francisco, California. Defendant does business in Massachusetts, including in Boston.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

- 7. Defendant Maplebear, Inc. operates a same-day grocery delivery service, which engages drivers across the state of Massachusetts to deliver groceries to its customers at their homes and businesses.
- 8. Instacart engages delivery drivers and full-service shoppers (both referred to here as "drivers") across the country to prepare and deliver grocery orders.1
- 9. Plaintiff Stephen Levine worked as a driver for Instacart from approximately July 2019 to July 2020.
- 10. Instacart has classified its drivers like Mr. Levine as "independent contractors," but under Massachusetts law, they should have been classified as employees.
- 11. Instacart drivers perform services within Instacart's usual course of business, which is a grocery delivery service. The drivers' services are fully integrated into Instacart's business. Without drivers to perform deliveries, Instacart would not exist.
- 12. Instacart drivers are not typically engaged in their own grocery delivery business. When delivering items for Instacart customers, they wear the "hat" of Instacart.
- 13. In addition, Instacart maintains the right of control over the drivers' performance of their jobs and exercises detailed control over them.

[&]quot;Full-service shoppers" shop for the grocery items, as well as deliver them to customers. Instacart also engages "in-store shoppers" (many of whom it classifies as employees) who pick out and shop for groceries but do not deliver the groceries. These "in-store shoppers" (who do not deliver) are not the subject of this Complaint.

- 14. Instacart communicates directly with customers and follows up with drivers if the customer complains that something was not delivered or that the delivery otherwise failed to meet their expectations. Based on any customer feedback, Instacart may suspend or terminate drivers.
- 15. Instacart customers cannot request a specific driver and must place their orders through Instacart rather than with any particular driver.
- 16. Instacart drivers do not need special qualifications or experience apart from a valid driver's license and two years of experience driving and the ability to lift 30-40 pounds (of groceries).
- 17. Instacart drivers sign up for shifts in advance and must wait in specified locations to receive deliveries.
- 18. Instacart does not reimburse drivers for any expenses they may incur while working for Instacart, including, but not limited to the cost of owning or leasing and maintaining their vehicles, gas, insurance, and phone and data expenses for running the Instacart Application. Drivers incur these costs as a necessary expenditure to work for Instacart, which Massachusetts law requires employers to reimburse.
- 19. Instacart drivers have not always received an hourly wage. Instead, they have been paid based on a combination of fees per delivery and fees per item purchased. Because Plaintiff and other Instacart drivers are paid by the delivery and do not receive an hourly rate and have been required to bear many of the expenses of their employment, their pay rates have often fallen below Massachusetts' minimum wage.

20. Instacart does not pay its independent contractor drivers any earned sick time. Plaintiff was sick during the period he worked for Instacart but was not able to receive sick pay for that time.

CLASS ALLEGATIONS

- 21. The Court should certify this case as a class action on behalf of all Instacart drivers who have worked as independent contractors in Massachusetts under Mass. R. Civ. P. 23 and/or Mass. Gen. L. c. 149 § 150.
- 22. The class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.

 Plaintiff estimates that Instacart has employed thousands of drivers in Massachusetts while incorrectly classifying them as independent contractors.
- 23. There are questions of law and fact common to the class, including whether Instacart has misclassified its drivers, failed to reimburse them for their business expenses, pay them minimum wage, and denied them sick leave.
- 24. The named Plaintiff's claims are typical of those of the class members.

 Plaintiff's claims encompass the challenged practices and course of conduct of
 Instacart. Furthermore, Plaintiff's legal claims are based on the same legal theories as
 the claims of the class members. The legal issues as to which laws are violated by such
 conduct apply equally to Plaintiff and to the class.
- 25. The named Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class. The named Plaintiff's claims are not antagonistic to those of the class and he has hired counsel skilled in the prosecution of class actions.
- 26. Common questions of law and fact predominate over questions affecting only individuals, and a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and

efficient adjudication of this controversy. This proposed class action presents few management difficulties, conserves the resources of the parties and the court system, protects the rights of each class member and maximizes recovery to them.

EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES

27. Pursuant to the state law requirements as set forth in Massachusetts

General Law Chapter 149 § 150, the above-named plaintiff has submitted his statutory

claims with the Office of the Attorney General.

COUNT I Wage Act MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL LAW CHAPTER 149 §§ 148, 148B

As set forth above, Defendant Instacart has violated the Wage Act by misclassifying its drivers as independent contractors pursuant to § 148B and by failing to reimburse them for their business expenses necessary to perform their work, such as gas and car maintenance, smartphones and phone data plans in violation of Gen. L. c. 149 § 148. This claim is asserted pursuant to Mass. Gen. L. c. 149 § 150.

COUNT II Minimum Wage MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL LAW CHAPTER 151 §§ 1,7

As set forth above, Defendant Instacart has violated the Massachusetts Minimum Wage Law, M.G.L. c. 151, §§ 1 and 7, by failing to ensure that its delivery drivers are paid at least the full state minimum wage. This claim is brought pursuant to M.G.L. c. 151, § 20.

COUNT III Sick Leave MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL LAW CHAPTER 149 § 148C

As set forth above, Defendant Instacart has violated the Massachusetts Sick Leave Law, M.G.L. c. 149 § 148C, by failing to pay Instacart drivers earned sick time at a rate of at least one hour for every thirty hours worked.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests that this Court enter the following relief:

- Certification of this case as a class action pursuant to Mass. R. Civ. P. 23 and/or Mass. Gen. L. c. 149 § 150 and Mass. Gen. L. c. 151 § 20;
- Restitution for all damages due to the Plaintiff and other class members
 because of their misclassification as independent contractors and related wage
 law and sick leave violations;
- 3. An injunction ordering Instacart to cease its unlawful practices;
- 4. Statutory trebling of damages;
- 5. Attorneys' fees and costs
- 6. Prejudgment interest; and,
- 7. Any other relief to which Plaintiff and the class may be entitled.

Dated: August 12, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

STEPHEN LEVINE, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,

~ fix toda

By his attorneys,

Shannon Liss-Riordan, BBO # 640716

Michelle Cassorla, BBO # 688429

Lichten & Liss-Riordan, P.C.

729 Boylston Street, Suite 2000

Boston, MA 02116

617-994-5800

sliss@llrlaw.com

mcassorla@llrlaw.com